REMARKS / ARGUMENTS

This application is believed to be in condition for allowance because the claims are non-obvious and patentable over the cited references. The following paragraphs provide the justification for this belief. In view of the following reasoning for allowance, the Applicant hereby respectfully requests further examination and reconsideration of the subject patent application.

1.0   Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112:

The Office Action of April 28, 2004 rejected claims 38-40 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. In particular, the Office Action objected to the use of the term "The system of claim 32" in each of the respective claims, as having insufficient antecedent basis.

In response the Applicant has amended dependent claims 38-40 to correct the limitation. Specifically, claims 38-40 now recite "computer-readable medium" in place of "system." Each of claims 38-40 depend from dependent claim 32, which in turn depends from independent claim 27. Claims 27 and 32 each recite "computer-readable medium" rather than "system." Therefore, it is believed that the correction of this inadvertent error in each of claims 38-40 fully addresses the antecedent basis problem that was correctly identified by the Office Action.

Therefore, in view of the aforementioned amendment, the Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the rejection of dependent claims 38-40 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph.

2.0   Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102(b):

The Office Action rejected claims 1-14, 16-19 and 21-25 under 36 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Breinberg et al. ("*Breinberg*," U.S. Patent 5,886,694). However, the Office Action also indicated that the claims 15 and 26 contained subject matter that would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Note that the Applicant respectfully disagrees with the arguments for rejection advanced by the Office Action with respect to independent claims 1 and 21. However, in order to further prosecution of the patent application, the Applicant has amended independent claim 1 to include the allowable limitations of dependent claim 15. Similarly, in order to further prosecution of the patent application, the Applicant has also amended independent claim 21 to include the allowable limitations of dependent claim 26.

Therefore, in accordance with indication of allowable subject matter advanced by the Office Action, the Applicant respectfully suggests that independent claim 1 now includes allowable subject matter. Consequently, the Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the rejection of claim 1, and of dependent claims 2-14 and 16-20 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) in view of the aforementioned amendment to independent claim 1.

In particular, independent claim 1 now recites the following novel language:

A system for automatically and dynamically laying out elements within a window, comprising:

specifying at least one dynamically resizable frame in a hierarchical tree structure within a parent window;

specifying at least one child element within at least one of the dynamically resizable frames;

automatically hierarchically computing a size of each dynamically resizable frame based on the hierarchical tree structure, beginning with any child elements

11

within each frame, up to the parent window, and then back down to the individual child elements within each frame;

automatically creating a minimum sufficient number of horizontal rows within at least one dynamically resizable frame for displaying each of the child elements within each dynamically resizable frame;

automatically arranging child elements within the automatically created horizontal rows; and

binding at least two child elements in groups of two or more for controlling how the groups wrap into the automatically created horizontal rows. (emphasis added)

Similarly, as noted above, independent claim 21 has been amended to include the allowable limitations of dependent claim 26. Therefore, in accordance with the aforementioned indication of allowable subject matter advanced by the Office Action, the Applicant respectfully suggests that independent claim 21 now includes allowable subject matter. Consequently, the Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the rejection of claim 21, and of dependent claims 22-25 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) in view of the aforementioned amendment to independent claim 21.

In particular, independent claim 21 now recites the following novel language:

A computer-implemented process for automatically arranging controls within a window of a graphical user interface, comprising:

constructing at least one dynamically resizable frame within a parent window;

inserting at least one control frame having at least one associated control into at least one dynamically resizable frame;

defining a preferred interrelationship between at least two controls in at least one of the dynamically resizable frames;

automatically creating a minimum sufficient number of horizontal rows within at least one dynamically resizable frame for displaying the controls within any of the dynamically resizable frames;

12

automatically arranging the controls within the automatically created horizontal rows in accordance with any preferred interrelationships between the controls; and

wherein at least one of the controls is a text control, and wherein any text contained within the text control is automatically wrapped to at least two lines within the text control where the text is too wide to fit as a single unwrapped text line within a particular horizontal row. (emphasis added)

3.0 Rejection of Claims 27-34 and 36-40 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a):

The Office Action rejected claims 27-34 and 36-40 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over **Breinberg** in view of admitted prior art (i.e., the "FlowLayout" class described in the JAVA™ 2 Platform, Standard Edition, v 1.3.1 API Specification).

However, the Office Action also indicated that the claim 35 contained subject matter that would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Note that the Applicant respectfully disagrees with the arguments for rejection advanced by the Office Action with respect to independent claims 27. However, in order to further prosecution of the patent application, the Applicant has amended independent claim 27 to include the allowable limitations of dependent claim 35.

Therefore, in accordance with indication of allowable subject matter advanced by the Office Action, the Applicant respectfully suggests that independent claim 27 now includes allowable subject matter. Consequently, the Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the rejection of claim 27, and of dependent claims 28-24 and 36-40 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) in view of the aforementioned amendment to independent claim 27.

In particular, independent claim 27 now recites the following novel language:

A computer-readable medium having computer executable instructions for automatically organizing elements within a user resizable dialog window, said computer executable instructions comprising:

adding at least one automatically reconfigurable frame to a parent window;

inserting at least one child element into at least one automatically reconfigurable frame;

specifying preferred indenting rules for at least one of the child elements;

dynamically creating wrapable horizontal rows within at least one automatically reconfigurable frame for displaying each of the child elements within any of the automatically reconfigurable frames;

automatically arranging child elements within the dynamically created wrapable horizontal rows in accordance with any specified preferred indenting rules as the resizable window is resized; and

binding at least two child elements in groups of two or more for controlling how the groups wrap into the dynamically created wrapable horizontal rows. (emphasis added)

CONCLUSION

In view of the above discussion, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1-14, 16-25, 27-34 and 36-40 are in immediate condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the outstanding rejection of claims 1-14, 16-25, 27-34 and 36-40 and to pass this application to issue at the earliest opportunity. Additionally, in an effort to further the prosecution of the subject application, the Applicant kindly invites the Examiner to telephone the Applicant's attorney at (805) 278-8855 if the Examiner has any additional questions or concerns.

Respectfully submitted,

Mark Watson

Lyon & Harr
300 Esplanade Drive, Suite 800
Oxnard, California 93036
(805) 278-8855

Mark A. Watson
Registration No. 41,370
Attorney for Applicant